DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 542 EC 131 747

AUTHOR Barresi, Josephine G.
TITLE Issues and Policy Options Related to the Education of Migrant and Other Mobile Handicapped Students.
INSTITUTION Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 80
GRANT G007702411
NOTE 79p.: A part of the Policy Options Project.
AVAILABLE FROM The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091 (free while supply lasts).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities: Educational Policy: Elementary Secondary Education: Equal Education: *Handicap Identification: *Migrant Education: Migrant Programs: Student Mobility: *Transient Children

ABSTRACT

Policy issues concerning mobile handicapped populations are examined. Surveys of states and onsite interviews were conducted as well as a literature search. Specific difficulties facing migrant students are considered and the inadequate amount of information on other groups besides the migrants is pointed out. Mobility is discussed as a national phenomenon and issues of handicapped children within transient groups of military dependents, adjudicated and incarcerated youth, foster children, and migrants are explored. Among problems cited in assuring these populations appropriate education are inadequate child find, interstate differences in special education eligibility requirements, and residency requirements. Two programs--The Migrant Student Record Transfer System and interstate compacts--are discussed as approaches to dealing with service incontinuity and identification problems. In the final section, policy options are identified in four major areas (identification and records, programing, funding, and administration). Positive and negative effects of options and their suboptions are listed. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED197542

ISSUES AND POLICY OPTIONS RELATED TO THE EDUCATION OF MIGRANT AND OTHER MOBILE HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

Josephine G. Barresi
Specialist for Policy Research

Policy Options Project

November 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CEC
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia

EC131747

Published in 1980 by The Council for Exceptional Children

The work performed herein was done pursuant to a grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (now the Office of Special Education within the Department of Education) (Grant Number: G007702411). The opinions expressed herein, however, do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: METHODOLOGY	3
Research Methodology	3
Previous Research on the Education of Mobile Children	6
Mobile Handicapped Students	9
Migrant Studies	11
Conclusions	15
CHAPTER II: THE POPULATION AND THE ISSUES	16
General Characteristics of Movers	16
Pupil Mobility	17
Military Dependents	18
Adjudicated and Incarcerated Youth	18
Foster Children	19
Migrants	20
Other Transient Groups	21
Mobile Handicapped Students	24
Handicapping Conditions Among Mobile Populations	24
Child Identification	25
Continuity of Specialized Services	26
Interstate Compacts and the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS)	29
Interstate Compacts	29
MSRTS	30
MSRTS Special Program Descriptions	31
Concluding Observations	35

	Page
CHAPTER III: POLICY OPTIONS	37
Policy Area 1. Identification and Records Options	37
1.1 Child Find	37
1.2 Register	37
1.3 Have Records Accompany, Rather than Follow, the Student	38
1.4 List of Types and Location of Records	39
1.5 Transfer of Records	39
1.6 Secondary Credit Exchange	40
Policy Area 2. Programming Options	41
2.1 Trial Placement	41
2.2 Extend Class Size	42
2.3 Flexible Scheduling	42
2.4 Tutorial Services	43
2.5 Out of School Programs	43
2.6 Mobile Facilitators	45
2.7 Mobile Education	46
Policy Area 3. Funding Options	46
3.1 Funding that Adjusts for Enrollment Variations	46
3.2 Funding that Adjusts for Population Size	47
3.3 District or State of Origin Pays	47
3.4 Priority Use of Funds	48
3.5 Special Entitlement	48
3.6 Child Count	49
Policy Area 4. Administration Options	50
4.1 State or Regional Reciprocity	50
4.2 Limited Reciprocity	50
4.3 Cooperative Efforts in State Plans	50
4.4 Monitoring	51
4.5 Contracting with Migrant Education	51
4.6 Research and Technical Assistance	52
REFERENCES	53
APPENDIX A	57
APPENDIX B	58

INTRODUCTION

The 200 year history of our country is a history of migration. Migration into the country from foreign lands, across the continent as westward frontiers opened and railroads crisscrossed the nation, migration to the cities in search of better job opportunities, migration to the suburbs and "back to the earth" in search of a better life. Currently, we are experiencing an internal migration which is redistributing population to the Sunbelt States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978).

Yet, the adventurous image this history brings to mind is far from the reality lived by hundreds of thousands of handicapped children who are mobile. The hardships of life for the migrant worker, the poorest subgroup in the mobile category, has been documented elsewhere. Some of the tragic statistics include a life expectancy of 49 years compared to a national average of 73 years, an annual income of $2,200, deplorably inadequate housing, nutrition and health care and an average 4th or 5th grade education level.

However, not all mobile children are poor migrant workers. For a few who are affluent, mobility is related to moving to a winter residence. For many in the military, duty reassignments determine mobility. For others there are different situations. Yet, regardless of income or employment status, the factor of mobility has serious implications for the education of handicapped children. Mobility interrupts learning, health care, training, teacher-student rapport and personal relationships.

Handicapped students who are mobile are isolated from the traditional service delivery methods. Child find, identification, assessment and placement policies and procedures designed for a stable and stationary population are frequently inadequate for children on the move. As a result, many mobile handicapped students are not identified. For those that are, a lack of continuity in programs, gaps and

delays in the resumption of services, repetition of processing formalities and other inefficient and ineffective treatment are serious obstacles. Education, conceived of as a single local education agency responsibility is a multistate reality for thousands of handicapped students who suffer reduced opportunities for access to a free appropriate public education because they are unable to remain in one location during the school year.

The Council for Exceptional Children through the Policy Options Project has undertaken a preliminary investigation of the impact of mobility on the identification of and delivery of appropriate education to handicapped students. The results of this investigation indicate that although the problems and barriers are formidable, they are not insurmountable. This paper is the result of that effort.

One significant issue impacting on this topic which will not be addressed by this paper are the bilingual needs of some mobile handicapped children. The extent of bilingualism or foreign language speaking among mobile populations is not known. Among the migrant population, as many as one-third of the students may fall into this category. The Policy Options Project is undertaking an investigation of this issue as a separate research activity.

The following chapters describe the methodology used to research this issue, discuss the phenomenon of mobility, and identify the population of mobile handicapped children. In addition, barriers and the potential corrective policy options which could guarantee educational rights and protections to these students are presented. The potential positive and negative effects of each policy options are presented to assist policy makers to make sound and responsible decisions.

CHAPTER I

METHODOLOGY

Chapter I discusses the methods used to examine the phenomenon of mobility, identify the handicapped related issues and develop and refine policy options which address the issues. It also reviews and summarizes pertinent literature.

Research Methodology

The mobile nature of the population being investigated presented unique implications for research as it does for service delivery. Therefore, a three fold methodology was followed which included a literature review, focused study of six states experiences conducted by telephone and mailed questionnaires and report analysis, and on-site interviews. An additional approach was investigative in nature and involved contacting individuals, agencies and organizations identified as potential sources of information either with respect to background or development of policy options. A list of all persons interviewed by phone, mail, or in person is contained in Appendix A. The literature review made use of both automated literature indices and materials obtained from identified primary sources of information.

Because states with high student mobility, generically defined, could not be identified, the six states in this study were chosen on the basis of their migrant education experience. These states included Florida, Texas, and California as homebase states; and New York, Colorado, and Washington as receiving states. Five of these states, Colorado is the exception, were chosen by the former U.S. Office of Education's Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation for the 1972 Evaluation of migrant Title I programs conducted by Exotech Systems, Inc. An additional factor influencing this selection is that three of these states, Colorado, Florida, and Washington, are represented on the Working Advisory Committee of the Policy Options Project. Answers to the following questions were compared to the findings of the literature search in order to determine the parameters of

mobility and identify the policy gaps and barriers which impact on the identification and education of mobile handicapped students.

1. Who are the mobile children in your state and how many of them are there? Who else besides children of migrant workers?
2. What is the incidence of handicaps among this mobile population?
3. When a student moves into a district, how is it known that s/he is handicapped?
4. What is the "lag time" between enrollment and the discovery of a handicap? Between enrollment and delivery of special education and related services?
5. What is the procedure for obtaining student records once it is determined or suspected that the child requires special education?
6. What is the percentage of success in obtaining records? Problems encountered? Are records requested actually forwarded?
7. Does your state accept referrals, assessments and IEPs from other states? Do districts within the state have reciprocity with each other? Or does the student, for example, automatically receive a current assessment in the new location? What are the differences in processing or treatment for in-state and out-of-state mobility?
8. What is the extent of state, regional and interagency cooperation regarding mobile students?

Once responses were received, follow-up phone calls were made where necessary to obtain additional information or clarification. As the purpose of this aspect of the research was exploratory in nature rather than to collect comprehensive data, the results of this activity will not be reported on a state by state basis but will appear throughout this paper. The questions listed above were sent by

letter to the state directors of special education in California, New York, Texas and Washington. In Colorado, the Commissioner of Education who sits on the Working Advisory Committee for the Policy Options Project was contacted. This individual in turn consulted the state's director of special education and supervisor of migrant education before responding. In Florida the contact was a local administrator of special education who represents the Council of Administrators in Special Education on the Working Advisory Committee for the Policy Options Project. This individual consulted Florida's Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students which at the time had no state-wide perspective on this issue and suggested obtaining information from Polk County, Florida. Polk County is reported to have the highest migrant population in the country. Subsequently, the special education director of Polk County was interviewed by telephone. Additionally, it was determined that the migrant office in Florida had no available data on the numbers of migrant students who were handicapped.

The third major research activity involved two days of site visits and interviews in New York state. New York was chosen for its proximity, its history of leadership and involvement in migrant education, the fact that it is one of few states which conducted an investigation as to the incidence of handicapping conditions among its migrant student population, its current involvement in a secondary credit exchange pilot project with Florida and its summer migrant tutorial programs. Interviews were conducted with the state directors of migrant education and special education, selected parents, and special education and migrant education administrators in the two most populous migrant BOCES (Board of Cooperative Educational Services). Identified regional and local staff with demonstrated experience and leadership relating to this study were also conducted either prior to, during or following this visit.

The purposes of this intensive visit were threefold: to expand the conceptualization of the mobile population, to determine firsthand the extent of interstate and intrastate barriers and cooperation and to determine the anticipated positive and negative effects of the identified policy options within the context of an operational system.

In addition to the above approaches, principal sources of information were the Office of Migrant Education of the U.S. Department of Education and the Bureau of the Census which provided documents and data primarily with respect to basic background and representatives of other mobile populations, such as the military and the circus.

Previous Research on the Education of Mobile Children

In conducting a review of the literature, Scorpio, the computerized index of the Library of Congress was first searched using the descriptors labor mobility, occupational mobility, residential mobility and internal migration. This was done to determine the magnitude and impact of the phenomenon of mobility in the nation. Additionally, the Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse for Exceptional Children semiannual indices for the past fifteen years was searched using the same set of key words as well as the descriptor student mobility.

In each case research proceeded backward from the current year. Results of these searches led to the elimination of most topics pertaining to labor, occupational and residential mobility as being peripheral to the focus of this paper. Pertinent findings are summarized in the section on the mobility phenomenon later in this paper. Only when these topics were crossed with education did germane references surface. The results of this search are reported below. However, to obtain information on populations who are mobile besides the migrant worker, an investigative approach of contacting individuals, agencies and organizations was necessary. These findings are presented in Chapter II.

A reasonable conclusion after reviewing the literature on populations who are mobile is that on the whole, it is fragmentary and of indirect applicability for purposes of this article. Yet, while not of direct interest, this information cannot be dismissed as irrelevant as they offer opportunities for making inferences because of their bearing upon the education of mobile handicapped students.

The first group of such references pertains to "articulation" in higher education. Parker (1979), for example, has postulated the need to endow colleges across the nation with what he calls a "common currency." He cites the growing numbers of college students who attend more than one school during their higher education career and notes the difficulties encountered in processing transferring students. Changing terminology and unit requirements into a more transferable nature is difficult without sacrificing individual college standards of excellance. As will be shown later, problems with the transfer of student records is also a major barrier to program continuity for mobile students at the elementary and secondary levels.

Other research has examined the relationship between mobility and achievement. Results generally indicate mobility to be inversely related to achievement. For instance, Benson and other (1979) found that the greater the student's mobility the worse the student performed in school and the poorer his/her adjustment. Metzger (1979) asserted that even changing (class) rooms within the same school negatively affects performance. Black and Bargar (1975), however, in a study relating pupil mobility and reading achievement concluded that the reading achievement of mobile pupils was not significantly different from that of stationary pupils.

A related area, the effects of mobility on self-concept, offers another way of approaching the issue. Representative of these studies is one by Gigliotti (1976), claiming that a loss of a sense of academic control, resulting in feelings

of powerlessness occurs among blacks having high residential mobility. This phenomenon was found to apply to students in other cultures as well. Wagner and Feletti (1974), for example, described the negative self-concepts that result when pupils frequently change schools in New Zealand.

Despite modest recognition of the phenomenon of educational mobility and some of its consequences for students, few solutions are offered to minimize the problem. A noteworthy exception was Splete and Rasmussen (1977) who discussed the counselors role in aiding children who move frequently. A Teachers Corp project attempted to identify migrant students educational needs in an effort to develop models for teacher roles and training programs needed to meet these needs.

Generally neglected in the literature are reports of pupil mobility and its effects upon schools and school districts. Certainly the extent to which pupils change schools during the year, within or between districts, as well as the characteristics of the mobile student population are factors that have significant implications for staffing, class assignments, curriculum design, purchasing, providing student transportation and establishing bus routes, record keeping and budgets. Goodman (1975) stresses the necessity of curriculum and guidance planning to cope with pupil mobility from school to school within the San Diego district. District wide curriculum sequences and centralized records of pupils help maintain educational continuity of children who change schools within the district during their elementary and secondary educational career. According to Goodman, seven to eight percent of those enrolled or 9,000 students per year change schools within the district, while less than three percent of the student population consists of exchange students from other school districts. The greatest problem in the latter case, Goodman reports, concerns record transfer. In many instances students withdraw from one school system without informing anyone of their intention to transfer. School staff spend hours trying to locate these pupils. In some instances

receiving schools do not request transcripts. In other cases, a school may refuse to forward a students records because of outstanding library fines or similar reason. Megiveron (1980) who developed a model for determining a student's longevity in a district, has also addressed this issue from the perspective of elementary and secondary schools.

Mobile Handicapped Students

According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (1971), no factual nationwide data on pupil mobility could be found beyond the late sixties. Similarly absent are references to policy developed to address articulation at the elementary and secondary level and to the unique problems encountered when handicapped students in particular move from one school to another.

While professional journals are mainly silent on many of the issues surrounding mobility in education, professional dialogue has not been silent and government reports and studies on this topic have been increasing in recent years. In most instances, however, these discussions are limited to the migrant child without acknowledging the broader mobile population. Nevertheless, the findings of several of these reports are particularly worthy of note.

A ten member panel representing professional and advocacy organizations studied the implementation of P.L. 94-142 and recommended that the legislation be amended to earmark money for handicapped migrant children (National Education Association, 1978). The Education Commission of the States (ECS) has been at the forefront of promoting dialogue between persons from migrant education, health and special education to discuss how services to migrant handicapped children can be improved. Its task force on Interstate Migrant Education appears to have been the first major professional group to recognize the unique problems encountered when handicapped migrant children move from school to school. Through the three consecutive reports on migrant education (Education Commission of the States,

1977-1979), ECS has drawn national attention to the complex needs of this group. In yet another example, a national evaluation of the Title I migrant education programs lead the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) to investigate the extent to which P.L. 94-142 is being implemented for migrant children (1979). While this study has yet to be completed RTI has also developed a strategy for utilization of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS)[1] in serving handicapped migrant students (1979).

To date only two states, Washington and New York, are known to have attempted systematic documentation of the prevalence of handicapping conditions among mobile students or of the problems encountered by mobile handicapped students and corrective activities. In Washington, Aguirre (1979) reported child find and identification activities and information transfer impeded, discontinuity of programs, lack of bilingual staff and of interagency and interprogram cooperation and placement time lines to be contributing factors to the problems faced by migrant handicapped students. Chapman (1978) in New York, found the prevalence of children with handicapping conditions among migrants to be comparable to the state's overall prevalence rate of five percent. However, differences appeared in specific categories. Many more migrants than nonmigrants were classified as educable mentally retarded while far fewer trainable mentally retarded and physically handicapped migrants were reported. These findings, unique in their field, may be the result of erroneous over-classification of migrant children in some categories coupled with a lack of adequate child identification overall.

A study of a different nature contributes support to the claim that unique problems do indeed exist when students are mobile, expecially when they move from state to state. An analysis of the definitions used by states in their special

[1] MSRTS is a national computerized data bank on migrant students. Further discussion appears later in this article.

education programs revealed certain differences across the nation (Newkirk, 1978). Not only did the names given to various categories of handicapping condition vary, but more significantly, the criteria by which children were judged eligible to receive special education and related services varied from state to state. The potential problems encountered by a student moving between states increases proportionately with the degree of interstate variation in eligibility criteria. Thus, a student may receive special education in one state but not another or be classified as learning disabled in one state and mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed or nonhandicapped in another due to differences in state policy.

Migrant Studies

Problems encountered when migrant students travel across state boundaries have been well documented along with innumerable recommendations for improvements. The two primary sources for migrant information are the seven major Title I Migrant Studies and the various reports of the ECS Interstate Migrant Task Force. The first study of the Title I migrant program was published in 1971. Among the findings of the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children were the following:

- Migrant children are found in 47 states. Most of the children will live for various periods of time in two or more states. Their periods of migration do not coincide with regular school breaks; and
- Given these patterns of migration, the education of migrant children is a problem and, as such, programs of education for these children should be national in scope and interstate in nature (National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children, 1971).

An audit of federal migrant programs conducted two years later by the U.S. General Accounting Office (1973) found that migrant children were not achieving at the grade level at which they were enrolled in academic skill areas and that they were performing below other students in their classes in these areas. The

report also revealed that some school districts that enrolled substantial numbers of migrant children were not participating in the federal migrant education program. Reasons found to be associated with nonparticipation in this voluntary program included unawareness of the program, lack of recognition that migrant children were enrolled in their schools, or unwillingness to participate because of the additional paperwork.

The first Congressionally ordered impact evaluation of the Title I migrant program was conducted in a sample of ten major migrant states (Exotech, 1973). Principals, teachers, aides, volunteers, students and parents were randomly selected and interviewed. Among the findings reported were the following:

- Migrant children have an 11 percent change of entering the 12th grade compared with an 80 percent chance for non-migrant children;
- Perceived academic failure and frustration are powerful factors in the migrant child dropout rate;
- Forty-four percent of the teachers interviewed did not use information from the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) because it arrived too late or not at all. They preferred to use their own assessments, or it was felt that the MSRTS information was not necessary or reliable; and
- A major obstacle to interstate and interagency coordination was the non-uniformity of definitional requirements for service eligibility.

As a result of this study, parent advisory councils were created and interstate coordination was strengthened. Another recommendation of the Exotech Study called for federal agencies to better coordinate their programs through standardized program definitions.

In the following year another audit of the Title I migrant education program (HEW Audit Agency, 1974) made the following recommendations:

- The Office of Education should strengthen its control over the MSRTS by establishing a review program;
- The Office of Education should establish or redesign an integrated management information system for the program to meet management's needs for data;

- SEA's should be provided with formal guidelines for identifying and reporting migrant children, both for planning and for improving the quality of input to the MSRTS; and

- Require that project applications include a description of eligibility criteria being used and reporting practices being followed so that the Migrant Branch, in their reviews, can detect inconsistencies with program criteria.

A study funded by Children, Youth and Families of the Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, found that the Title I migrant program had the greatest impact of any federal program on the welfare of migrant children. However, the study revealed that records continuity and program coordination needed to be strengthened at the local, state and federal levels. The 1977 study also highlighted day care and preschool services as priority needs and recommended that children aged 0-5 be counted for funding purposes (Inter America Research Associates, 1977).

In contrast to the previous report, the National Child Labor Committee, utilizing previous reports and field investigations, issued a highly critical report charging major problems in the administration of the migrant education program at local, state and federal levels (National Child Labor Committee, 1977). Simultaneously, an administrative study (National Council of La Raza, 1977) recommended long and short term changes in operations, resources responsibility and other administrative concerns affecting the delivery of services to migrant children.

The Interstate Migrant Education Task Force, a project of the Education Commission of the States, is currently funded by eight project member states - Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Michigan, New York, Texas, and Washington under the Elementary/Secondary Act Title I Migrant Education, P.L. 93-380, as amended. Its purpose is to address the issues of interstate and interagency cooperation in migrant education. The first interim report of the Task Force (1977) introduced basic policy issues and proposed recommendations for federal, state, and local levels of government. In the following year, the Task Force targeted several areas

where improvements were especially needed. Among these were early childhood education, staffing, parent involvement, evaluation and monitoring, and information and secondary credit accrual and exchange. Germaine to this research topic, was a recommendation to include student individualized education programs (IEPs) and other special education information on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (Interstate Migrant Education Task Force, 1978). By 1979 when the third interim report was published, many of these areas were still problematic for migrant students, although most authorities agreed with the recommendations for their resolution. In addition, two new issues, bilingual education and health services were explored and recommendations made. Several recommendations that have implications for handicapped migrants include:

- Matching the MSRTS health record to that of other health service programs, such as Title XIX;
- Promoting cooperation between private physicians, migrant health clinics and MSRTS health records in non-Title I project areas; and
- Expanding the age of children served and funded under ESEA Title I migrant education from 5-17 to 0-21.

A forthcoming final report is expected to present the activities undertaken to encourage adoption of Task Force recommendations by federal, state and local agencies, and legislative bodies. In addition to these documents, conference reports on several issues have been compiled and disseminated by the Education Commission of the States. One of these, "Secondary School Programs for Migrant Students" (Hunter and Perry, 1980), provided background for the identification of problems relating to graduation requirements and mobile students. A second conference report, "Special Educational Needs of Migrant Handicapped Children" (Gonzales and Hunter, 1980), identified major policy barriers and service delivery problems. These reports are discussed in greater detail in the following section.

The final document that treats with some detail the migrant child with special needs is the Interstate Migrant Education Task Force Report (1979) on Migrant

Health. A significant finding of this study was the lack of data concerning migrant children with handicapping conditions despite the expectation that such conditions would be widespread, given the low level of general health and health care among this population. Three reasons were proposed to account for this lack of data:

- Migrant children may not be separately identified as such when schools or agencies conduct counts in the areas of handicapped;
- Migrant children may not remain in a district/community long enough to be identified as eligible for assistance as a handicapped child; and
- Handicapped migrant children may remain in the family's home base state and therefore not be counted as an interstate migrant child.

Conclusions

It is clear from the review of the literature that little information exists on the needs of other groups of mobile students besides that of the migrant child. In summary, the following conclusions may be drawn from the review of the literature:

- Mobility negatively affects achievement and self-concept;
- Information, planning, and management systems do not presently address the issue of student mobility at the elementary and secondary school levels;
- Existing child find and identification procedures are inadequate for a mobile population;
- Interstate differences impede access to special education programs;
- There is less parent involvement among mobile populations than among stationary ones;
- There is inadequate interstate and interagency communication and cooperation on these students behalf;
- Handicapped children are not appropriately reported on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System; and
- There is little information on the types of children who are mobile other than the migrant child.

CHAPTER II

THE POPULATION AND THE ISSUES

As demonstrated in the previous section, literature germaine to the present study is fragmentary and obliquely related. This section discusses mobility as a national phenomenon and identifies the handicapped students in particular who comprise the mobile category. Problems and issues related to assuring access to an appropriate education and improving educational continuity for students who are transient will also be highlighted. The final section will present policy options and their positive and negative consequences in response to the issues set forth in the first two sections of this paper.

General Characteristics of Movers

What are the characteristics of movers? The most recent study by the Bureau of the Census reports that movers are likely to be younger and better educated than those who do not move. Their 1978 study on Geographical Mobility revealed that 63.4 percent of persons 25 to 29 years old had changed residence as compared to fewer than 20 percent of persons 55 years old and over who moved during the same period. Many people in their late twenties are starting new jobs, buying a house or moving to larger living quarters because of increasing family size or are moving to locations more convenient to schools rather than to social and recreational amenities which attract single persons and childless couples. Persons in their forties and their teenage children have mobility rates intermediate between the extremes of the young adults and older citizens. Young children also have high mobility rates reflecting the high mobility of their young parents. Forty-one percent of those five to nine years old in 1978 have moved within the previous three year interval. In all, over 21 and one-half million children aged 3-19 changed residences during the period, the majority moving long distances.

For nearly every type of move, those with at least some college were the most likely to move and those with only elementary school education were the least likely.

Movers with some college are more likely to move long distances and to a different county than within the same county than persons with less education.

The Census study further indicates that patterns of moving vary by race as well as by age and education. While blacks and whites changed residences at about the same rates (35.4 percent and 34.0 percent, respectively), blacks were more likely to move within the same county, whereas whites were more likely to move long distances. In fact, 74.3 percent of blacks who moved during the three year period were moving within the same county. In contrast, only 57.9 percent of the white movers made in-county moves. Urban renewal, condominium conversion, inadequate housing and increasing rents may account for much of the in-county black mobility. Movement between central cities and suburbs were about equal for both races. Both were twice as likely to move from the central city to the suburbs as the reverse.

Unfortunately, the Census data do not measure or report the number of moves an individual makes during a given time period. Persons who moved more than once are counted only once; and persons who moved out of their current residence but returned within the three year period were not counted at all.

Pupil Mobility

Pupil mobility, the extent to which pupils change schools during the school year, is more difficult to determine. The only available report containing nationwide data is nearly ten years old (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1971). According to this report, eight percent of the total school enrollment entered public elementary and secondary schools after the fall enrollment. This percentage accounted for 3.7 million pupils in 1968-69 and affected nearly every school district in the country. Since the Census does not report the extent to which these same pupils moved a second or third time during the year, the actual number of pupils moving may be somewhat less than the above figure.

Nevertheless, the data suggest significant consequences for educators. Revenue sources for schools are tied to shifts in enrollment. The main methods used to account for students, i.e., membership as of a given date and average daily membership (ADM) for the school year, do not reveal mobility statistics. Thus, schools with many mobile pupils can have the same membership or ADM as schools with a very constant enrollment, yet the aggregate membership would be greater for schools with high mobility; reflecting the number of different pupils served. A companion problem is that attendance statistics do not reveal the actual enrollment of pupils during the year because those students entering and leaving during the school year are not counted. Because of a lack of current national data on phenomenon of pupil mobility in general and the mobility of handicapped students in particular, the following sections report on data compiled from groups with transient constituents.

Military Dependents

The Department of Defense has no available information regarding the number of children of service personnel who move each year. While these figures are not compiled by the military, the average length of a tour for military personnel is three years. This regular pattern of mobility in the military may or may not interrupt education during the school year depending on when the transfer occurs.

However, Colordao State Department of Education, in responding to queries for this paper, revealed that in the high density military area of El Pasco County, Colorado, 62 percent of the handicapped population move during the year (Frazier, 1980). The frequent turnover among military dependents is a problem in certain districts of each state contacted for this study.

Adjudicated and Incarcerated Youth

The relatively short periods of confinement and the frequency of repeated

confinements among the adjudicated youth population makes consideration of this population group as a subset of the mobile population both necessary and reasonable. Statistics, for example, compiled by the General Accounting Office (in 1974-or in 1974-75) and reported by Hockenberry (1979) revealed the following period of confinement for handicapped juveniles in the five states studied:

TABLE I

CONFINEMENT PERIOD IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

State	Number of Institutions	Range of Average Period of Confinement
California	3	10 to 11 months
Colorado	4	6 to 9 months
Connecticut	4	4.3 months - juveniles 10 months - youths aged 16 to 18 (treated as adults)
Texas	4	6 to 8 months
Virginia	7	6 to 13 months

Smith (1978), who noted a greater prevalence of handicaps among North Carolina's incarcerated youth, found a widespread lack of organizational planning and evaluation procedures designed to meet the special educational needs of the incarcerated students.

Foster Children

The Social Security Administration compiles data on the more than 100,000 children participating in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Foster Care Program. This program provides room and board for children removed from their homes. However, these figures do not reflect mobility or even average lenght of placements, nor do they include children in foster care not eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children assistance.

Because some placements are temporary or not successful, it is likely that some children in foster care have high mobility. In such instance, the children are removed and placed again as many times as necessary until appropriate care is established. A study of foster care revealed that the length of time in foster care as well as the length of time in the current placement varied widely from

state to state (Vasaly, undated). For example, 26 percent of California's foster care children had a total placement time of six months or less compared to 43 percent in Iowa with a total placement time under ten months. Eleven to fifteen percent of the children were moved four or more times with the average time in placement between two and one-half to five years. Vasaly (p. 56) cited at least one state as reporting "that foster home replacements were frequent and that little help is given either the foster parent or the child in understanding the reason for the moves."

Migrants

Perhaps the largest subgroup within the mobile student category are children of migratory farm workers and fishers. Although the Migrant Office of the Department of Education acknowledges that there is no way of determining exactly how many migrant children are uncounted (USOE Briefing Paper, 1978), enrollments on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System currently exceeds half a million students. As noted in the previous section, the ECS Interstate Migrant Education Task Force was one of the first groups to call attention to the educational problems experienced by migrant handicapped children. In 1978, the Second Interim Report of this Task Force recommended the following:

> "Special education information, including student individualized education plans (IEP's), be transmitted on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System to insure that handicapped migrant children are served according to the provisions of Public Law 94-142." (p. 14-15)

While national data on the length of time migrants spend in each state is not generally available, state education officials unofficially estimate that this varies according to state. Most migrants remain in Colorado for about four months. These workers spend most of their time in Texas. Migrants from Florida spend about three months in New York, while others from Texas spend some time in California and Washington. Washington reports the average length of stay to be

only 18 days for a "true" mobile migrant. Of course, the condition of the crops, the weather, and pay rates are often unpredictable making changes in this "schedule" the rule rather than the exception.

Obtaining information about the state practices is influenced by the state of the art in documenting mobility of children. Although there have been scientific advances in tracking systems, information systems and interagency data sharing, too little has been done to adapt these results to education systems. According to a recent report by the Council of State Governments (1978), states are unable to document placements and population flow on a systematic ongoing basis. Sporadic special attempts have been successful but few long range planning efforts seem practicable from a logistics standpoint.

Other Transient Groups

Research reveals many other groups of students whose mobile lifestyle interrupts learning. For example, Indochinese refugees were once picked up on the MSRTS as migrants in Louisiana where they settled following their arrival to this country. Similarly, Orthodox Russians from Brazil enroute to Alaska were identified as migrants in Oregon. These and other refugees travel through many states before settling down permanently. While the children of such refugees could not be served by migrant education because they were not "true" migrants according to the federal definition, they were mobile.

Many other aliens, some legally in this country such as those mentioned above, and others here illegally, but whose presence is widely acknowledged and in some cases encouraged, have high mobility rates. The enormous difficulty of carrying out child find activities among this group is exacerbated by their fears of deportation and language barriers. New York City has an estimated undocumented alien population of one and one-half to two million (Grument, 1980); Dade County, Florida,

estimates 20,000 (Hinesley, 1980); other areas in California, Texas, and Florida contain equally large numbers.

Some Puerto Rican children frequently travel between the island of their parents and the metropolitan New York area or the fur farms in upstate New York. Puerto Rican laborors feed and care for the animals used in making fur coats. At pelting time they are replaced by Algonquin Indians from Canada who annually migrate across the border for this task. Children of circus and carnival workers and stage and movie performers have also been reported as being highly mobile in California and Florida. The major circus, Ringling Brothers, Barnum and Bailey, employs two teachers who travel with the show instructing the children who are enrolled in the Calvert Correspondence School. In fact, according to the Census Bureau, operatives (mainly factory workers), laborors and construction workers and professionals have a higher mobility rate than farm laborors (11.8 percent, 11.51 percent, and 9.65 percent respectively compared to 9.32 percent for 1975-76). However, one Bureau of Labor employee suggests this figure may be biased as it was obtained in March, a month of low farm labor use. Nevertheless, the magnitude of worker mobility is established (Census, 1977).

In addition to children who are mobile due to employment opportunities, one local special education director in Florida reported that about five vacationers to that state each week enrolls a child in his district. Length of enrollment varies with length of vacations or part-time Florida residency.

Homebound and/or hospitalized students are another group which may be considered mobile. A proposed resolution (1980), cited a Tennessee study revealing that 74 percent of all Homebound/Hospitalized students were temporarily restricted for a short term, usually less than eight weeks.

Finally, there are the children whose mobile parents leave them behind in state institutions, or in the case of some American Indian migrants, in government

operated boarding schools (Inter America Research Associates, 1977). The degree to which these children change institutions or schools could not be determined.

In-state mobility is far less documented than that between states. Some states report such mobility is the result of not being able to pay rent because of poverty. In New York state, most families who travel within the state are employed in the dairy industry, although some are tenant farmers in the vegetable fields or canning plant employees. Although dairy work is not seasonal, it is estimated that dairy workers move every ten months.

Analysis of these many varied groups reveals two distinct categories: Occupational mobility and dependent minor mobility. The occupational mobility category, the larger group, includes children who travel with their families as they move for employment purposes. Migrant and seasonal farm workers and fishers, military families, circus, theater, movie, other entertainers and performers, and workers in energy development and construction owe their mobile status to their employment situation.

The second mobile category are often too young for employment. These are dependent minors who are sent by agencies or guardians from one location to another in search of a home, a better life or special treatment. In this category are found children in foster care, adjudicated youth, those who require short-term hospitalization, and immigrant or alien children who are shuttled back and forth between the homeland of their parents and relatives living in America. Major differences between these two groups are that dependent minors are scattered across the nation; they lack the support of a concentrated community that shares their mobile status; there are different agencies delivering services to them; and they travel alone.

Mobile Handicapped Students

Other researchers have documented the difficulties inherent in the migrant lifestyle. Many of these problems are interdependent on one another and affecting the entire life of the family members. Problems such as inadequate housing, low pay, poor health and nutrition, limited English speaking ability, and other factors detract from the quality of life for these people. While some of these problems also exist for other groups of mobile people many of them do not. Optimally. educational issues should be analyzed within the larger socio-economic situation; a procedure made impracticable by the diversity of the mobile population. Yet, many of the issues surrounding lack of special educational opportunity and continuity for handicapped students cut across subgroups and affect all mobile handicapped students.

Handicapping Conditions Among Mobile Populations

Studies of various groups such as adjudicated youth, migrant workers, and foster children, have hypothesized a higher incidence of handicapping conditions among their members (Smith, 1978; Education Commission of the States, 1978; Inter America Research Associates, 1977; Children's Defense Fund, 1978). This is a generally held assumption based on patterns of disrupted learning, lack of educational continuity, often poor health and nutrition in formative years and corollary effects of social and emotional stresses.

On the other hand, state studies of handicapped migrant children yield somewhat different results. While Aguirre (1979) found a higher incidence of suspected handicapping conditions among the migrant worker population in Washington, Chapman (1978) in New York reported the migrant handicapped population closely approximated the state's figure of five percent handicapped. In Colorado, only 8 out of nearly 4,000 migrant children were identified as handicapped (Frazier, 1980), which is

much lower than the state-wide incidence rate. No other state contacted had such data collected.

One of the major reasons why there are different findings lies in the fact that records from the various agencies do not contain complete data. Besides incomplete data on mobility which was discussed earlier, differences in terminology, diagnostic procedures and record keeping result in incomplete data on handicapping conditions among the various populations under consideration. Another difficulty is the transitory nature of the populations. This in itself may be an argument in support of the hypothesis.

Child Identification

It is generally recognized that existing child find procedures are inadequate for mobile families (see Table 2).

TABLE II

NUMBER OF IDENTIFIED HANDICAPPED MIGRANT STUDENTS
IN SELECTED STATES WITH MIGRANT POPULATIONS

State	Total Migrant	Handicapped Migrant	Percent
California	111,379	---	---
Colorado	3,750	8	0.2%
Florida	48,306	---	---
New York	2,855	142	5%
Texas	216,247	---	---
Washington	12,694	529	4%

California, Florida, and Washington figures were obtained in August 1980 from the Department of Education, Migrant Office. The others were reported by the states for this study.

All too frequently their handicap and subsequent need for special education and related services are not identified (Aguirre, 1979; ECS, 1980), Anecodotal reports indicate a further need for greater community outreach into migrant labor camps to locate handicapped children who are not sent to school for a variety of reasons. Others report the transitory nature of the students discourages the identification of the need for special education. When a student is enrolled in a district for only three months of the year a disincentive exists for the expenditure of diagnostic resources. Many reasons have been put forth to explain this lack of identification. Among them are the following:

- Many mobile handicapped children are never enrolled in school or are allowed to dropout early by their parents;
- Teachers do not get to know the mobile child's needs. Mobile children often are not in one school long enough for teachers to observe performance and decide whether educational problems require a referral for special education assessment or are merely the result of sporadic attendance and frequent changes in enrollment;
- Once mobile handicapped children are referred for assessment, they may move on before the process is begun or completed. Usually, the next school in which the student enrolls, is unaware that such assessments have been carried out; and
- The culture and language of the students may cause difficulties in accurate diagnosis.

Continuity of Specialized Services

The second major problem confronting the mobile handicapped student concerns continuity in receiving an education once the student has been determined to be handicapped and in need of special education and related services. Such students frequently create problems in class assignments and class size determinations due to state regulated maximum special education class sizes (Mack, Barresi, and Bunte, 1980). Students who arrive during the year are difficult to serve since special classes are often full. As a result, additional teachers must be hired, space prepared, materials ordered and all of this may reverse within a matter of months.

When the mobile student is present in the beginning of a school year, or when class assignments are first made, the situation is not as problematic.

Moreover, state funds, allocated on the basis of average daily attendance or average daily membership, can pose serious financial burdens on districts when they decrease as students move out. Local education agencies must make up the deficits from their own sources of revenues or find more handicapped children to fill the vacated slots.

Beyond these considerable difficulties are other barriers which impede service delivery to mobile handicapped children and youth. Such barriers have been noted to include:

- Interstate differences in special education eligibility requirements. For example, New York's criteria for learning disabilities is stricter than that of other states.

- Residency requirements. Some states and presumably some districts, charge tuition for nonresidents. In Florida this policy is largely intended for children of vacationers. In practice, it is waived whenever an indigent child would otherwise be excluded from school. In Texas, plaintiffs have challenged this policy through court suits such as Doe v. Plyler.

- Waiting periods and limited program options. Classes for low incidence handicapped children are especially susceptible to this problem according to the Education Commission of the States, as there are fewer teachers, lower teacher-student ratios, and higher costs associated with these programs.

- Interstate differences in minimum competency testing and graduation requirements. While Hockenberry (1979) and Rosewater (1979) have already called attention to the implications of such policies with respect to handicapped children in general, this issue becomes even more complicated when mobility is considered. For example, in which state should the mobile student be tested? If s/he moves to a different state after failing the test, how can s/he take part in the remedial programs offered? According to Hunter and Perry (1980), interstate differences in graduation requirements place migrant students "in a game where the rules for success are constantly changing" (p. 9).

- Incomplete and inadequate transfer of records. It is frequently not known whether the child has received special education or whether recent assessment information and individualized education programs (IEPs) have been transmitted. Even for migrant students enrolled on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System, problems are encountered when information is not reported or not requested.

- Scheduling and program model inadequacies. Due to their mobility, many transient handicapped students have irregular school attendance as well as reduced instructional time. For some, like the migrant child, summer attendance and alternatives to traditional programming would vastly improve their chances for an education.

- Lack of communication and cooperation between programs and agencies serving mobile students. Special education and migrant education, the military, foster care agencies, youth corrections and others must share information and resources if the needs of handicapped mobile children are to be met.

Besides these barriers, the ECS Seminar on Special Education for Migrant Children with Handicapping Conditions (Gonzales and Perry, 1980), held this year in Phoenix, identified the following additional problems:

- Districts may be reluctant to identify a new high need population because it would alter plans and thereby cause personnel and financial problems since under P.L. 94-142 unserved populations must be served first.

- The appeals process is state based and, thus, disputes may never be settled for interstate migrants. Moreover, there is also no mechanism for continuing an appeal across state lines.

- The Bureau of Community Health Services migrant health clinics are not required or encouraged to exchange information with special educators.

- The affect of federal and state privacy laws on the transmission of special education records is unclear.

- Career education programs for handicapped migrant students are virtually nonexistent. As a result, handicapped migrant students have less chance of achieving independence than their nonmigrant handicapped peers. As the migratory population "settles out" into urban areas, skills needed for employment outside of the fields, orchards and boats need to be taught.

Unfortunately, information on special education and the application of P.L. 94-142 for mobile handicapped students is surprisingly limited; however, what information is available depicts a bleak picture in several significant areas.

- No state in the study monitored the delivery of special education services to mobile populations or even to migrant students.

- No state required the submission of incidence data from school districts or from migrant education regarding handicapped mobile students.

- No policy could be identified dealing specifically with mobile handicapped students.[2]

- States with the largest migrant populations, i.e., Texas, California, and Florida, did not have current data on the number of handicapped migrant children and youth. Other states with sizeable migrant populations only have the results of studies done in previous years.

- Few opportunities existed for the sharing of expertise, information or resources among programs and agencies serving mobile populations.

Interstate Compacts and the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS)

Two programs of a national scope presently exist with some potential to ameliorate some of the identification and program continuity problems faced by transit or mobile handicapped children: Interstate Compacts and the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS).

Interstate Compacts. Three interstate compacts exist to facilitate the interstate placement of children: The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children, The Interstate Compact on Juveniles and the Interstate Compact on Mental Health. In addition, the Interstate Compact on Education facilitates the sharing of policy, practices, trends and other relevant information. None of these compacts, however, whether taken singly or in combination would be sufficient to track, place or monitor mobile handicapped students. Designed as administrative mechanisms to prevent abuses and neglect to children and define jurisdictional responsibility across state lines, these compacts include handicapped children only if they are mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed and placed in out of state institutions. None of the compacts permit parents, guardians or relatives of the child, to utilize the compact. For this as well as other reasons, a

[2]Some states have developed policy pertaining to migrant handicapped students. Louisiana, for example, requires that the individualized education program or IEP contain "a description of any special instructional needs related to status as a currently or formerly migratory child" (Act 754 Regulations, Education of All Exceptional Children § 441 D17).

considerable number of noncompact placements are conceded, although national documentation is lacking.

A study by the Children's Defense Fund (1978) concluded that participation in the compact seemed to have little effect on either the knowledge of state officials about children placed out of their state or on state efforts to monitor what happens to such children. The report further revealed that there is no requirement for placement in the least restrictive alternative or for continued monitoring of the child's program or practice while in placement.

Under the Interstate Compacts the sending agencies must provide appropriate authorities in the receiving state with: the child's name, date and place of birth; the names and addresses of parents or legal guardians; the name and address of the person, agency or institution with which the child is to be placed; and a statement of the reasons for placement. The state receiving the child is not required to submit specific information back to the sending state about the child's adjustment or progess.

If Interstate Compacts are to become a viable solution to some of the problems of mobile handicapped students, several changes will have to be made: complete data on the extent of out of state placements will have to be mandated; information sharing will have to include specific information about children with handicaps; and a reexamination and clarification of state v. compact monitoring responsibilities.

MSRTS. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, P.L. 89-10, as amended, provides for payments to state education agencies for assistance in educating children of migratory agricultural workers or migratory fishers. Children aged 5-17 are eligible to receive such services for as long as five years after their families have stopped migrating and settled in one location. Funds are provided for programs which are designed to meet the unique educational needs of

migratory children, and to coordinate these programs with those in other states. Each year since the inception of the program, funding has increased from approximately $10 million in fiscal year 1967 to over $173 million in fiscal year 1979.

The Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) is a computerized student data network headquartered in Little Rock, Arkansas. MSRTS was created to improve educational continuity for migrant students by providing centralized storage of migrant student records. This system is funded by an equal percentage of each state's allocation set aside by the U.S. Secretary of Education. The system provides the official count of migrant children for computing state allocations. Access is achieved via a telephone call to one of 150 computer terminal operators who verbally relay the information to the requesting school within a day of the request. A printout of the records is then mailed. Many earlier difficulties, such as confidentiality problems, differences in curricula and reporting terminology, have been largely resolved. Presently, MSRTS provides information for over a half million children aged 5-17. Yet, according to a USOE Briefing Paper, an additional 500,000 children have yet to be entered into the system (USOE, August, 1978). No one knows how many children are really involved, although the MSRTS is changing this.

A major gap in the system as it presently exits is the absence of linkage with the Migrant Health Centers. Health information from these centers is currently shared within the Health Network, but not with schools, however, differences in terminology between Health and Education Agencies are being resolved along with other administrative barriers. Eventually, schools may be able to obtain complete health data on a routine basis for all migrant students which will be a valuable aid in child find and screening activities.

MSRTS Special Program Descriptions. MSRTS is programmed to indicate students enrolled in "special programs." Currently, three hundred and eighty-one special

programs can be coded into the system. This category includes special career programs, vocational education, home economics as well as tutorial programs.

Thirty-three of the "Special Program Descriptions" on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System are clearly related to the handicapped (see Appendix B). However, these are interspersed among nearly 350 other academic and extracurricular programs in which migrant students may be enrolled. The variations and inconsistency of descriptions, abbreviations, and repetitions among this list make it extremely difficult to decipher. For example, six codes refer to speech programs and nine to programs for learning disabled children. None of these codes appear consecutively. Thus, a teacher in Texas might record that a child attended a "communicative disorder class" (code 325), but a teacher in New York might note that codes 066 "Speech Corrections" or 072 "Speech Therapy" were not reported and thereby not identify a speech handicapped child. Others may look only at code 070 because that reports students in "Special Education," and miss students reported in one of thirty other categories. In addition, the description of code 070 limits it to mentally retarded students. No code appears for blind or "other health impaired" children, although code 256 reports enrollment in a sight improvement program. There is a category for deaf education (code 222) but not for less severe hearing impairments. The orthopedically handicapped child would not be reported unless enrolled in physical therapy (code 276). Physical and occupational therapy are the only two related services included.

At least 10 other descriptions may also apply to handicapped students although this relationship is not clear. Categories such as LMTD PHYSICAL ACTIVT (code 270), PERCEPTIONAL MOTOR SKILLS (code 203) and HOMEBOUND INSTR (code 012), may apply to any child. The difficulty arises in differences in interpretation between the sending and receiving state's school district personnel.

MSRTS Special Test Codes are equally difficult to use effectively. Over 4500 partially alphabetized tests are listed, however, even this enormous list is not complete. For example, intelligence tests such as the Stanford-Binet and Leiter International Performance Scale are included, but the Wechsler tests are omitted.

There has been great concern on the part of MSRTS users to protect the confidentiality of students. Therefore, records of a sensitive nature tend not to be entered into the system. At this time, it is not possible to determine whether the migrant student has been referred for special education, whether assessments have been initiated or completed, or whether s/he has had an individualized education program developed and moved just short of placement. Unless the student previously received special education and related services, the system cannot identify him or her.

Research Triangle Institute (RTI, 1979) in North Carolina recently completed a study recommending changes in the MSRTS in order to accommodate handicapped students. If adopted, these recommendations would alert the school to the student who is known or suspected of having a handicapping condition, who has received special education and related services and who has a prepared IEP. However, the Disability Information Update Form, one of the RTI recommendations, does not permit the receiving school to determine if psychological or other handicapped assessments are available independently for students who do not have an IEP and/or have been provided special education and related services. MSRTS staff reports it will be another year to a year and a half before decisions are made regarding these recommendations.

Another area in which improvements in records transfer are being explored is known as the secondary credit exchange program. At the present time, MSRTS contains only the number of hours a student is in a program. Based on a pilot project tested

between the Texas and Washington migrant stream for the past four years and more recently expanded to the eastern migrant stream between Florida and New York, changes are being explored in the reporting of secondary credits. This would require each state to submit a plan to Little Rock, Arkansas, containing the graduation requirements, the method of credit accural and the subject used. MSRTS could then be revised and expanded to reflect a generic code that would embrace all differences, rather than use area subject headings and include Carnegie units, semester hours or other credits earned. A school would receive the recommended schedule for each term based on the graduation requirements in the student's home state. When the student leaves it would send the courses completed, days of attendance and grade as of the day of withdrawal.

The degree to which difficulties encountered in fulfilling graduation requirements when a student enrolled in several states with varying requirements effects the 90 percent dropout rate among migrant students is not known. Nevertheless, improvements in the secondary credit exchange program hold the promise of giving many of these students their first real opportunity to earn a diploma.

The MSRTS functions like the proverbial chain: it is only as strong as its weakest link. The system depends on each school to relay complete, accurate relevant student data in a timely fashion. A difficulty frequently reported during this research is that the student sometimes arrives at school B before school A has recorded their records onto the computer. Another problem reported is that on occasion it is not known that the child is migrant so MSRTS records are not requested.

In a perfectly functioning system which has incorporated the RTI recommendations, completed the health and education coordination, improved the secondary credit exchange and in which staff records and requests records without fail, the needs of all migrant handicapped students may be met. Yet, change is slow.

Considerations of jurisdiction, Congressional intent, privacy and the needs of the children must be explored. A yardstick for progress can be found in the fact that it took 30 months for the states to agree on the initial contents of the system (USOE, August, 1978). With the proper legal and administrative authority, the MSRTS could be expanded or duplicated to include records of children in foster care, military dependents, adjudicated youth and those others besides migrants whose families move for employment purposes.

Concluding Observations

It is estimated that at least 15 percent of the American population move to a different residence each year. Over the three year period 1975-1978, more than one-third of the country's population had changed location (Census, 1978). This incredible mobility of our nation's people is a factor long noted by state and local planners, corporate and financial analysts, marketing managers, bankers, economists, builders, realtors, and social scientists, but it has been a neglected area of investigation in education. Although traditionally special educators and migrant educators have viewed their missions as quite different and separate, both are becoming aware of the deficits in providing an appropriate education to mobile handicapped students. Such an awareness also seems to be increasing among state education officials with respect to the need for more interagency and interstate cooperation.

Generalizations from such limited literature and small sample of states must be advanced with caution, however, these findings indicate that much of the data obtained from state officials and other individuals support the findings in the previously reported studies. With these limitations in mind, several conclusions are offered:

1. The degree to which information is exchanged between states, agencies, and districts has critical implications for the education of mobile handicapped students. A fundamental principal

of state government should be coordination with other state education agencies (including special education and migrant education components), with other programs within the state such as Title I, Migrant Education and Bilingual Education, and with other agencies including the military, foster care, child welfare and youth corrections. Joint planning and shared responsibility are the only hope if this population is to receive an appropriate education.

2. The persistent problem of inadequate data about this population must be addressed. Critical areas of research surround the need for nationwide data regarding incidence, policy and practice, parent involvement, training needs and resource analysis.

3. The issue of "first dollar" responsibility for mobile students has got to be resolved. A comparison of the quality and level of service among states utilizing various options to address this problem would be instructive. Other financial barriers occuring because funding systems are based upon a stationary population must be identified and eliminated.

4. A final observation concerns the need for programming which acknowledges and adjusts for student mobility.

With these points in mind, Table 3 contains policy options, along with their potential positive and negative effects to address the issues, concerns and barriers associated with special education service delivery to mobile handicapped children and youth. Unless otherwise indicated policy options are written for consideration by state and local policymakers.

CHAPTER III

POLICY OPTIONS

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS

POLICY AREA 1. IDENTIFICATION AND RECORDS OPTIONS

OPTION 1.1 CHILD FIND

Each state, district and intermediate education unit shall establish effective procedures to identify handicapped children who are mobile. Such procedures shall include, but not be limited to, establishing cooperative agreements with those programs and agencies responsible for mobile students, such as migrant education, migrant health clinics, the military, youth corrections, child welfare, and foster care agencies, alien or immigrant community and advocacy groups, circuses and carnivals, Indian tribes and major sites employing temporary workers, such as energy development plants and major construction sites. Such agreements shall include the following areas, where appropriate: child find, cooperative planning (including input and review of annual program plans, migrant education plans, etc.), parent training and liaison, information exchange, student record transfer and staff development. Other components of such a child find effort shall include direct community outreach, public notification, and targeted parent and teacher training.

OPTION 1.2 REGISTER

Each state shall establish and maintain a register of its mobile handicapped students. The register shall identify the locations where the student has been in attendance and relevant special educational records, files and documents, such as referrals, assessments and IEPs and their location.

POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.1

- More children with special educational needs would be identified as a result of this option than would be possible without it.
- There would be improved efficiency in the delivery of services from the standpoints of both initiation and continuity.
- Such cooperation between agencies increases public awareness, strengthens the goals of human service agencies and utilizes scarce fiscal resources most efficiently and effectively.
- By utilizing agreements and providing training the potential exists for using established personnel, such as migrant education recruiters, to find potential handicapped children.

POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.1

- Bureaucratic red tape may present initial obstacles.
- Potential conflicts in agency policies regarding responsibilities, confidentiality and access to records and differences in reporting requirements, to name a few, may need to be analyzed and resolved.
- Such agreements are time consuming to negotiate and frequently succeed or fail due to the characteristics of the personalities involved unless they are mandated rather than voluntary.
- It may be more realistic to require an initial state level child find program as agreements and communications between states and between state agencies may be necessary to pave the way for local action. District and intermediate child find could then be added in a second phase.
- Unless existing personnel were trained for child find, such an operation would be costly.

POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.2

- This option would help insure the provision of appropriate education and improve continuity for students who are mobile. It has been reported that children sometimes transfer to a neighboring locality and records are not sent for because it is not known that the child attended school in the neighboring district. Perhaps one or two moves occurred since that enrollment. Records of referrals and assessments conducted at previous sites are frequently omitted from the records at the newest location. When records are requested, no evidence of previous or suspected special educational needs is found.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 1.3 HAVE RECORDS ACCOMPANY, RATHER THAN FOLLOW, THE STUDENT **It shall be the policy of districts to have records accompany the child whenever the child is handicapped, mobile and receiving or suspected of requiring special education and related services. This may be an independent policy or part of interstate or interagency agreements. A copy of all records shall be retained for the time required by state law. This option does not preclude schools from requesting and forwarding records upon request.**	POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.2 • A definition of mobility would have to be developed. • A student might suffer some negative consequences of the handicapped label when this is only suspected and not confirmed or when the student no longer requires special education, but the label remains in his/her school record. (The latter could be avoided by maintaining a former special education student in the register for a limited period, such as two years. Students with no handicap related history during the preceding two year period would be removed from the register.) • **Confidentiality and access standards must be assured.** • This option would only be useful for interstate mobility. • Without adequate teacher training the system would likely go unused. POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.3 • Delays in the transfer of records between schools would be reduced or eliminated. • Gaps and incomplete records that result when the previous schools are not known would be eliminated. Many schools only send records originating at their location, not those that have been forwarded to them. • Some schools synthesize and summarize previous school records. If parents transmit all the records, original source material would be available. • This option would make parents a more active participant in their child's education. They might feel more important and be better informed if they had this kind of access to and responsibility for records. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.3 • Unless parents understood and respect the importance of the documents they might loose them or forget to deliver them to the school. • The mobile lifestyle of the family would seem to make finding specific items difficult amidst the frequent packing and unpacking of family belongings.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 1.4 LIST OF TYPES AND LOCATION OF RECORDS Section 121a.565 of the regulations for P.L. 94-142 requires that "Each participating agency shall provide parents on request a list of the types and locations of education records collected, maintained, or used by the agency." However, when a student transfers to another school, it is usually the receiving school making the request for records to be forwarded. If psychological reports or referrals, IEPs, or other records are not kept in the student's cumulative school folder, the receiving school may never be aware that such special educational records exist. It is necessary to exceed the minimum requirement of §121a.565 for the mobile student who is either handicapped or suspected of being handicapped. Policy: It shall be the policy of educational agencies and institutions to collect and forward all education records, files, documents and other materials which (i) contain information directly related to a student; and (ii) are maintained and used by the agency or institution whenever such records are requested by officials of other schools or school systems in which the student seeks or intends to enroll. In accordance with Section 438(b)(1)(B) of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (Buckley Amendment), the student's parents must be notified of the transfer, receive a copy, if desired, and have an opportunity for a hearing to challenge the content of the record. **OPTION 1.5 TRANSFER OF RECORDS (FEDERAL)** Because the phenomenon of student mobility is national in scope, a national system is needed to facilitate the maintenace and transferring of special educational records for mobile handicapped students. Three options exist to achieve this objective. **OPTION 1.5.1 TRANSFER OF RECORDS (FEDERAL)** The Department of Education may adopt the recommendations of the Research Triangle Institute for using the Migrant Student Record Transfer System to better serve handicapped migrant children.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.4 • Gaps and incomplete records that result when special education records are kept separately would be eliminated. • Delays in the transfer of records would be reduced by making the sending district responsible for sending all the student's records upon request. • Original source material rather than a synthesized and summarized record would be available. • Confidentiality requirements of the Buckley Amendment would be met. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.4 • While confidentiality is satisfied legally, some would feel existing legal protections are inadequate considering the senstive nature of the records involved. • Parent notification has been broadened to parent permission in some states and localities, creating a bottleneck in the efficient transfer of records. • There is a danger of losing documents in the mail unless an office or agency keeps the original. POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.5.1 • The provision of services to handicapped migrant students would be considerably enhanced by adopting this option. Gaps and delays due to incomplete transfer of records would be virtually eliminated. • The subsequently recorded information could provide a vital data base upon which to base evaluation, planning and development activities. • Child find as well as service delivery would be greatly improved among this population with proper training of migrant recruiters and teachers. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.5.1 • Other mobile handicapped students would still be without remedy. • The Disability Information Update Forms, one of the RTI recommendations, does not permit the receiving school to determine if psychological or other handicapped assessments are available independently for students who have not yet received an IEP and special education and related services. • As indicated by RTI, unless both migrant project and nonproject schools participate in this data collection plan and a completed form is available for every migrant child, valuable information on the handicapped migrant may be lost. • Research which doesn't analyze resistence to change and recommend avenues for change only does part of the job. No one seems to know what all the constraints are but MSRTS appears unlikely to institute the RTI recommendations in the foreseeable future.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 1.5.2 TRANSFER OF RECORDS (FEDERAL) The Office of Special Education, with proper authority from the Secretary of Education, may contract for the use of the computer facilities of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System. It can use this existing system to improve the transferability of special education records, (i.e., referrals, assessments and IEPs) of mobile handicapped or thought-to-be handicapped students.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.5.2 • All mobile handicapped students, not only migrants, could be included in this arrangement. • Although some costs would be involved, the amount is less than if a separate parallel system were established. • The positive effects of Option 1.5.1 also apply to this Option. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.5.2 • No authorization exists for such a project. Funding would probably require Congressional action. • The Secretary may need to clarify the legality or approve the use of the MSRTS by another office in the Department.
OPTION 1.5.3 TRANSFER OF RECORDS (FEDERAL) The Office of Special Education can create a similar but wholly independent nationwide, computerized system to handle special education and handicapped related records of mobile students.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.5.3 • This option would improve the identification of and provision of services to all mobile handicapped students, as would the preceding option. • This option also enables the documentation and analysis of the subsequently recorded data, as do the first two options. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.5.3 • This option would be the most costly of the three to implement. • Legislation with an appropriate authorization would appear to be necessary. • It would take the longest time of the three options to operationalize.
OPTION 1.6 SECONDARY CREDIT EXCHANGE A home base state shall be identified for each mobile student. This state shall be responsible for issuing a diploma to mobile students who meet the graduation requirements in the home state. In order for students to be able to meet these requirements, the home base state shall be responsible for sending to each other state in which the mobile student enrolls the following information: the requirements for graduation, and the proposed schedule for the semester(s) that the student is out-of-state. The receiving states in turn shall agree to enroll the student in the courses recommended by the home state and send back to the home state the following information on an official high school transcript: the courses in which the student was enrolled and the credit earned, his/her grade as of the date of withdrawal and the number of days in attendance. The home based state shall accept work completed in another state as partial fulfillment of its own graduation requirements.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.6 • Students can graduate on target with their nonmobile peers. • Some prevention of the high dropout rate at the secondary level can be anticipated. • An exemplary secondary credit exchange project is participating in the National Diffusion Network with migrant education funding and can provide technical assistance to help states adopt their model. • Vocational options and higher educational opportunities are anticipated byproducts of rises in graduation rates. • The self-concepts of the students can be expected to benefit as academic achievement improves.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
POLICY AREA 2. PROGRAMMING OPTIONS OPTION 2.1 TRIAL PLACEMENT When a handicapped student arrives in a new location, he/she shall receive the identical special education and related services specified in the IEP developed at the previous location for 30(60) days. During this time differences in eligibility requirements can be determined, additional assessments conducted if necessary, and the IEP can be reviewed and revised where needed.	POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 1.6 • Unless classes meet at a time when the students can attend (usually late afternoon or evening for working mobile students), this program may not be enough of an incentive to keep students enrolled in high school (Hunter and Perry, 1980). • In order to implement such a program, districts with small enrollments may have to virtually tutor each student individually in accordance with the home based states requirements. • It may be difficult to determine the home based state for some children. • Curricular differences between states may be a barrier. (However, particular textbooks needed could be loaned from one state to another to insure course compatibility as is presently done between Texas & Washington to some degee. • Unless enrollment patterns can be predicted, schools will have difficulties determining what courses they need to offer and how many staff will be needed. • This option will not help students who move before completing a course unless instructional objectives planned and mastered are exchanged (Hunter and Perry, 1980). • This option will not help students who move before completing a course unless instructional objectives planned and mastered are exchanged (Hunter and Perry, 1980). See also New York State's competency based external degree program. • In many states graduation requirements are set at the local level and states do not have the means of issuing diplomas. • A wholly independent special education credit exchange program in addition to the efforts already begun in migrant education would be a duplication of effort. These programs should cooperate. POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.1 • Such a policy will help insure continuity in the delivery of services for handicapped children. • Regression caused by gaps in services can be avoided. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.1 • If the program changes following the 30(60) day period, the positive effects of this option may be reversed. For example, if it is determined that a child is not eligible to receive special education in the new location, regression, adjustment problems, or a lack of educational progress may result. • It can be difficult to try to duplicate a service from one location to another. Differences exist in program models and curricula. It may be difficult to duplicate schedules and duration of services immediately upon arrival. • This policy is useless without improved record transfer.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 2.2 EXTEND CLASS SIZE **When mobile handicapped students temporarily enter an area, the maximum class size in special education programs (and caseloads for related service personnel) may be extended (to a specified point) by the addition of a full time aide.** NOTE: This option does not imply that teaching responsibility will fall to unqualified staff.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.2 • Such a policy may prevent students not being served or prevent delays in the resumption of services due to classes being filled to maximum before their arrival. • Aides tend to be easier to recruit and employ than special education teachers and related services personnel. • It is easier to relocate aides or hire them for temporary positions, and they are less costly than teachers. • Having one or two extra students and an aide may be more preferable than having a maximum size class and no aide. Most schools have so few migrants that large classes would not in fact occur. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.2 • It can be argued that decisions about class size should be based on the individual needs of the particular handicapped students involved, rather than be determined by the type of program.
OPTION 2.3 FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING **When required by a mobile student's individualized education program, flexible scheduling, including, where necessary, weekend, evening and summer programs, must be provided.** NOTE: In rural areas this option would best be implemented if a teacher were hired to work weekends and evenings. During times when no mobile students are enrolled, the teacher could provide GED courses, adult education, or work for other programs.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.3 • This option would allow students whose mobility interrupts their education to compensate by attending school when they are in one location, such as during summer months. • Students who must work during traditional school hours may still have the opportunity to receive an education by attending at other times. • Flexible scheduling may be the only chance for some secondary aged students to graduate. • The availability of summer programming for handicapped students may be a factor in encouraging stability among some mobile populations. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.3 • The negative effects of this option are additional administrative and financial burdens on schools, unless grants or agreements enable federal programs, such as Title I, Migrant Education, and Title IV-C, to provide funding.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 2.4 TUTORIAL SERVICES Section 121a.551(b)(2) of the regulations for P.L. 94-142 requires that each public agency, "Make provision for supplementary services (such as resource room or itinerant instruction to be provided in conjunction with regular class placement." For handicapped students who are frequently absent due to mobility, compensatory tutorial services delivered by qualified special educators may be required. Therefore, such services shall be part of each agency's continuum of alternative placements, and shall be made known to parents and shall be provided when specified in a student's individualized education program.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.4 • Tutoring students can effectively diminish the interruptive effects that mobility has on learning. • Tutors can ease the transitions to new school environments. • Without such one-to-one assistance, many mobile handicapped students will not be able to survive the frequent changes in environment, curriculum methods and materials without serious negative consequences on self-esteem and achievement. • Tutorial programs have worked successfully with mobile populations, such as migrant students in New York. • Tutoring enables a student to be educated in a regular classroom, rather than in a more restrictive environment. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.4 • No major negative effects appear to exist as long as placement decisions are made on an individual basis and such programs do not result in a segregated program for all handicapped mobile students.
OPTION 2.5 OUT OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS School districts shall make available a variety of out of school programs to enable handicapped mobile students to continue their education during periods of relocation or whenever they do not attend school. The main condition to be met in granting credit for alternative experiences is the existence of a clear connection between the student's educational goals as expressed in his/her individualized education program (IEP) and the experience in question. Examples of such programs include the following (from Barresi and Mack, 1980): • Work-Training Programs - This option allows students to explore career interests in occupational fields through a program not offered in the regular or special high school curriculum. The school can often provide course work pertinent to these careers and coordinate a work experience program with employers that enables students to obtain on-the-job training in an occupation of their choice. • Work Study Programs - This combination affords students an opportunity for earning income while attending school at least half-time. Such programs may be offered in conjunction with cooperative vocational education or special education. Such a flexible arrangement is offered to accommodate the needs of some students and their families while earning credit toward graduation. • Credit for Part-Time Work Experience - According to the National Association of Secondary School Principals, about three-fourths of all youth at age 17 work either part-time or full-time. Education is becoming more broadly defined rather than being considered	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.5 • Alternative approaches to satisfying graduation requirements permit adaptation to the individual learning styles of students as well as to their objectives (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1975). • Out of school programs can reallocate school resources from remediating problems to preventing problems (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1975). • Such options can assist students to avoid failure; they provide a fresh start for students whose adjustment to traditional schooling is poor (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1975). • When such programs are designed by the team responsible for developing the student's individualized education program (IEP), the doctrines of least restrictive environment and appropriate educational placement commensurate with the needs of the student, promulgated by P.L. 94-142, can be met (Barresi and Mack, 1980). • Specific advantages to correspondence courses and independent study is their low cost and the elimination of conflicts between state or local requirements due to the fact that students bring the work from their home district with them no matter where their families move (Hunter and Perry, 1980).

POLICY AREAS

only as "schooling." Students with employment experience may obtain credit for such experience as a substitute for class attendance and course and unit of credit requirements. The district may award credit if the student's work experience resulted in learning outcomes that relate to the student's educational goals. Criteria must be set specifying the number of hours per week or per semester and the amount of credit to be granted.

- Early Graduation if Accepted in Program of Vocational Training or Upon Job Entry - Students age 16 or older with two full years and 10 credits of completed high school including demonstrated job proficiency or one credit in a vocational course may graduate early. A cooperative agreement among parent, teacher and employer is required. A diploma may be granted after successful completion of the equivalent of two years of vocational or on-the-job training such as in a Vocational Rehabilitation Program for the Blind or Mentally Retarded.

- Credit by Examination - Students may be allowed to demonstrate their knowledge and skills by passing a performance test in lieu of attending classes in required or elective courses (such as Home Economics, Vocational Agriculture, Industrial Arts, Health and Physical Education). Not only may the required course be waived, but credit units may be granted upon passing. A strong advantage to credit by examination is that student and teacher time is put to better use. Students are not required to take courses if they have already mastered the content.

- Independent Study - Students may be permitted to independently complete the requirements for credit in required or elective course areas. This option may be particularly necessary for students who are frequently absent during school hours. The course objectives, activities to be completed and time lines must be preplanned along with the evaluation process and staff coordinator responsibilities.

- College Credit Alternative - Handicapped students who are accepted into an accredited post-secondary institution after three years of high school may be granted a diploma following successful completion of two semesters of college.

- Community Service Activities - Students may receive credit for volunteer work or hands on field experiences in local industry, government agencies, community organizations, cultural institutions and the like which increases their knowledge and skill in required areas of study. By recognizing the community as an extension of the classroom, valuable educational experiences available to students are increased.

- Approved Correspondence Schools - High school graduation credit may be obtained and attendance on campus may be waived for students who successfully complete approved correspondence courses.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS

POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.5

- The need for flexibility in granting credit is unique neither to special education nor to mobile students. Unless such alternatives were available to each student ill will and charges of preferential treatment could ensue.
- Socialization and other benefits of school attendance are lost (Hunter and Perry, 1980).
- A specific drawback to the correspondence course approach in particular is that students may not be able to get help when they do not understand the material (Hunter and Perry, 1980).
- Students in transient or temporary circumstance such as those of migrants, circus performers, construction workers, may not have the necessary supervision, support and motivation to complete work independently or after hours.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS

- Night School and Summer School - Students who have been unsuccessful in a class, who wish to complete high school earlier or who desire electives not available in the district's normal session may be permitted to take courses for credit in summer or night school programs.

- Special External Curriculum - Programs such as Outward Bound, survival training, educational summer programs, supervised travel and art workshops may be substituted in lieu of classroom attendance. Unit credit for course requirements may be obtained.

- High School Equivalency Testing - This alternative may be appropriate for students who have not completed a formal school program leading to graduation from high school. A youth or adult may demonstrate educational growth since withdrawing from school by taking high school equivalency tests. Those who obtain satisfactory scores are eligible to receive an Equivalency Diploma - the legal equivalent of a regular diploma issued by a local high school.

OPTION 2.6, MOBILE FACILITATORS

Each state shall employ individuals whose role would be to travel among mobile groups for the purposes of (i) carrying out child find, screening and identification procedures among the mobile populations identified in this paper, and (ii) facilitating continuity in the delivery of special education and related services for those mobile students who require them.

NOTE: Once migratory patterns or communities with concentrations of mobile students were identified, the mobile facilitator could be assigned a geographic area to reduce travel time and increase effectivenes.

POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.6

- Many of the problems encountered when handicapped students are mobile could be greatly reduced or eliminated.
- Such individuals would establish relationships with families to promote involvement in special education, encourage school attendance, improve record transfer, facilitate appropriate placement in new locations and assist with student adjustment problems.
- The location of special services, such as programs for the deaf and blind, if known by a family prior to moving, could be a factor in determining the next place of residence. For example, migrant families may work on alternate farms, military families may apply for "compassionate reassignments," foster homes may be chosen in a nearby area, etc.

POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.6

- Such special education mobility specialists would not be quite as effective with children who travel individually rather than in blocks, such as foster care children. Although with variations, a similar idea may be used.
- To be most effective, extensive inter- and intra-state travel would be required. This is both costly and seriously limits the amount of time available in which to work.
- Supervision would be difficult.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 2.7 MOBILE EDUCATION States either individually or jointly shall establish and maintain mobile units, programs, or classrooms for handicapped students who are transient. Standards of a home or resident state or of an accredited correspondence school would be met.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.7 • Continuity of education need never be interrupted. • A precedent for this model exists in the educational program of the Ringling Brothers, Barnum and Biley Circus. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 2.7 • This option would only be feasible among the migrant population due to the fact that other groups have too few numbers and travel too individually to be effectively taught together. Even in the migrant group, the incidence of handicapping conditions among families who move in the same pattern may be too low to make this option practical. • This option may confront the least restrictive environment requirement of current law. • The lack of exposure to nonmobile, as well as nonhandicapped peers, is undesirable.
POLICY AREA 3. FUNDING OPTIONS OPTION 3.1 FUNDING THAT ADJUSTS FOR ENROLLMENT VARIATIONS The fiscal system of each state shall be designed to adapt for variations in enrollment. The system must compensate for the unique burden placed on some districts with fluctuating (increasing as well as decreasing) enrollment. It must generate funds for eligible students regardless of when they begin to receive special education and related services (Weintraub and Higgins, 1979).	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.1 • Districts enrolling large numbers of mobile students will not be penalized by an inflexible funding system designed for stationary populations. • By eliminating such barriers as "cut-off" dates for statewide reporting, states can generate funds for mobile students no matter when they arrive. Prorated funding is one approach which can compensate for enrollment variations. • Extra costs, such as transportation between migrant labor camps and schools, extra teachers and supplies, can be assimilated when the funding system adjusts for surges in enrollment. • The special education population in general is fluid and there is a legal obligation to serve handicapped children no matter when they are identified. Such an adaptable fiscal system insures that state aid is delivered to districts and that the state fully meets its obligations without placing unique burdens on districts. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.1 • Administration of the mechanics of such funding can be complicated. • Since students may move to more than one location in the state, they may be generating state aid more than once. • It is difficult to reduce expenses even when enrollments decrease. For example, a program of six physically handicapped students may cost just as much as one with an enrollment of eight. Major costs such as salaries and transportation are unchanged.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 3.2 FUNDING THAT ADJUSTS FOR POPULATION SIZE The fiscal system of each state shall be designed to generate funds on an individual child cost basis (Higgins and Weintraub, 1979). State policy shall not require that a minimum number of children requiring similar services (e.g., speech therapy) have to be identified before state aid is provided.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.2 • Delays in receiving services will be eliminated. Often districts having an insufficient number of children to trigger state aid placed such children on waiting lists, overloaded existing programs or were forced to strain their own budgets. • Districts will not be forced to bear a disproportionate amount of the costs for educating children with low incidence handicapping conditions. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.2 • As in the case of Option 3.1, administration of the mechanics of such funding can be complicated. • Since students may move to more than one location in the state, they may be generating state aid more than once. • It is difficult to reduce expenses even when enrollments decrease. For example, a program of six physically handicapped students costs just as much as one with an enrollment of eight. Major costs such as salaries and transportation are unchanged.
OPTION 3.3 DISTRICT OR STATE OF ORIGIN PAYS State policy shall require the home base state or district of residence to be responsible for the costs of educating mobile handicapped students.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.3 • Such an incentive may eliminate discrimination against out of state/district students with respect to setting priorities and scheduling services, such as testing. Most decisions would naturally favor identifying students who would remain in a program to benefit from it and who could generate funds before identifying transients. • Sending districts/states may be encouraged to identify the student themselves rather than process payments for someone else to do it. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.3 • It may be difficult to establish the place of origin in some cases because this may require determining where the parents pay taxes or which state is the guardian in the case of wards. • Enforcement and collection of payments can be difficult. • This option would place major financial burden on a few states. • There may be legal barriers which make this option unfeasible.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 3.4 PRIORITY USE OF FUNDS (FEDERAL) Recommend that the Office of Special Education issue a policy declaration indicating that intrastate and interstate coordination, programs and projects is a permissible use of P.L. 94-142 funds as such activities will be targeted toward the unmet needs of handicapped students (see §116d.40).	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.4 • Such a declaration would strengthen and clarify the requirements of the law by drawing states attention to this needed priority area - a fitting step as these students often belong as much to the nation as a whole rather than any one state. • A declaratory statement of permissibility may be politically preferable to setting forth a mandate establishing mobile students as a national priority while achieving the benefits of an incentive. • Such an option has a precedent under ESEA Title I programs for migratory children. • Programs of education for mobile children need to be national in scope and interstate in nature (Wednesday's Children, 1971). • Federal as well as state administration of programs for mobile students need to be improved if a free appropriate public education is to be a reality for all handicapped children. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.4 • It may already be clear to some states that such a use of funds is permissible rendering this declaration unnecessary. • States may resent further federal intervention in special education policy. • The lack of a clear mandate or requirement regarding such coordination may limit the impact of this option. • Research has acknowledged certain problems with local responsibility for these students, perhaps due to a limited state of the art in this area. Yet this option addresses an across the board permissibility for the use of funds, rather than limiting such use to the 25 percent administrative set aside. The latter approach may be a more realistic option as the solutions to the problems of mobility may need initial state level action to achieve.
OPTION 3.5 SPECIAL ENTITLEMENT (FEDERAL) Either by amending the Education of the Handicapped Act or through some other legislative action, Congress should create a special entitlement for the development and implementation of special education programs for mobile handicapped students.	POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.5 • The success of similar programs, such as P.L. 89-313 and P.L. 89-750 (Title I state handicapped and state migrant programs) which concentrate on meeting the specific needs of vulnerable children recommends this approach. • Since money would be specifically targeted for such children, many current disincentives against identifying them would be eliminated. • Because of the considerable problems involved in serving mobile handicapped populations, particularly across state lines, more federal assistance is required than is currently provided under P.L. 94-142. • Such students can be said to belong as much to the nation as a whole as to any one state--a condition befitting a more responsible federal role in assuring their appropriate education.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
	POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.5 • A more politically feasible alternative may be to establish a discretionary or pilot program for mobile handicapped students.
OPTION 3.6 CHILD COUNT (FEDERAL) Amend P.L. 94-142 to require an FTE count based upon the calendar year, instead of the present single December 1 child count.	**POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.6** • Such a count would permit both the actual number of students, as well as the period of residence, to be considered in determining state and local allocations. • Federal special education funds would be more equitably distributed according to the proportion of time the student spends in the state. Currently, only one state may count the student and receive federal reimbursement, even though the child may attend school in several states. There is no provision for the money to follow the child. • Such an option presumably would provide a financial incentive to states to identify and serve mobile handicapped children, regardless of their length of stay in the area. • This option may enable patterns of mobility to be documented and used in planning and coordination. **POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 3.6** • Current authorization levels are so low that it may not be worth the time and effort to split the pot two or more ways. • The only amendment to P.L. 94-142 changed the child count procedure to the current December 1 date. While this amendment did not change the allocation formula, it appears unlikely that another amendment based upon the same issue would succeed. • Because of poor school attendance, states and districts would receive less than a full-time equivalent, unless each state's total FTE is multiplied by another factor (such as a percentage of the state or national average per pupil expenditure) to compensate for time out of school. • Handicapped mobile children are an unserved and underserved population for which no accurate estimate of size exists. Without a child find effort, states can still refuse to take responsibility for locating and serving these children. A phase-in to this option following a period of child find may better achieve the desired results.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS

POLICY AREA 4. ADMINISTRATION OPTIONS

OPTION 4.1 STATE OR REGIONAL RECIPROCITY

Each state, either through state law, interstate agreements, regional compacts or other arrangements, shall agree to serve mobile handicapped students identified in any other state by delivering the special education and related services specified in the student's individualized education program.

OPTION 4.2 LIMITED RECIPROCITY

For those children who travel in blocks such as migrant children, it may be possible to identify clusters of states through which the families pass somewhat consistently. These states could then either reciprocate in the delivery of special education and related services as in Option 4.1 or reciprocate in the identification phase alone. In the latter case, the states in the cluster, e.g. Texas, California and Washington, would share tests and other assessment and eligibility requirements with each other. Then, no matter where the student was identified and referred for assessment, the procedures of all the states would be met if the child were mobile. So, for example, a migrant child identified in Washington state as possibly requiring special education for a suspected learning disability would be given the tests and measured against the criteria established in California and Texas for learning disabilities, as well as in Washington. Results of the assessment and the comparison analysis would be reported in the student's record.

OPTION 4.3 COOPERATIVE EFFORTS IN STATE PLANS (FEDERAL)

Recommend that future guidelines from the U.S. Office of Special Education for the preparation of annual program plans under P.L. 94-142 contain the following requirement: Each state application must contain a description of the steps the SEA will take to insure educational continuity for handicapped students who are mobile. This description shall include the information that the SEA will pass on to other SEAs and appropriate procedures for coordinating its state program with programs of other states.

Such guidelines shall also require that other programs and agencies involved with mobile populations (Migrant Education, Foster Care, Military, and Youth Corrections) participate in the development of each state's annual program plan. Since state plans have begun a three-year cycle, a special amendment for the nearest fiscal year and each year remaining in the cycle would be required to implement this option in a manner fairest to the unserved and underserved mobile handicapped students.

POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTIONS 4.1 AND 4.2

- Duplication of effort would be avoided with consequent conservation of resources.
- Eliminating repeatedly administering the same tests likewise eliminates the invalidating effect of this practice.
- This option may result in the identification of some students who are not enrolled in some localities long enough for the assessment process to be completed, but who can be appropriately instructed once this is done.
- Time saved by identifying students as soon as possible can be later used to deliver appropriate education.
- A precedent and successful model for this option can be found in the Interstate Reciprocity of Teacher Certification.

POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTIONS 4.1 AND 4.2

- If all states have the same obligation, each may wait for the other to fulfill it.
- Only migrant children and circus performers tend to move in blocks, and only migrants move among a predictable cluster of states. Thus, Option 4.2 has limited applicability to ameliorate the problems in the identification of mobile handicapped students. (Option 4.1, on the other hand, remains viable.)

POTENTIAL POSTIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 4.3

- By making such planning a requirement for receiving federal funds, public attention will finally be focused on the needs of mobile handicapped children.
- Unless such a state of awareness exists, change will be fragmentary, slow and cannot result in significant benefit to children. When children move from state to state, all states must establish policies to accommodate them or none will benefit.
- The availability of such data would enable the OSE to improve its technical assistance in this area. It could compile the best practices reported and disseminate them to the states.
- Such an open-ended requirement as this will enable states to carry out a variety of activities as befitting their particular situations, such as, establishing resource or regional centers, secondary credit exchange programs, contracting for the delivery of services to children, training for teachers and parent involvement.
- A precedent for this option can be found in ESEA Title I programs for migratory children.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 4.4 MONITORING (STATE AND FEDERAL) State and federal monitoring of the delivery of free appropriate public education to mobile handicapped students must be routinely carried out. This goal can be achieved by incorporating some or all of the following activities into established monitoring procedures: • During Program Administrative Reviews conducted by the Office of Special Education, monitors may investigate the activities undertaken to identify the mobile handicapped child, including evidence of interagency cooperation in child find, community outreach, and teacher training. • Requiring states/districts to count and report the number of handicapped students who are mobile. • Comparing days of attendance for mobile handicapped children with the student population as a whole. • During on-site visits, activities should include mobile children in proportion to their representation in the district or state being monitored. Thus, the IEPs of mobile children would be reviewed, mobile parents and teachers of mobile children interviewed in appropriate representative numbers. • The proportion of mobile versus nonmobile students in various categorical programs (EMR, LD, TMR, etc.) may be reviewed as possible indicators of problems with identification procedures. • State and Office of Special Education materials relating to monitoring (such as questionnaires, interview guides, self-study procedures, etc.) should include examples of activities to conduct which include mobile students and a statement of the standards against which agencies will be compared. These materials should be disseminated prior to monitoring.	**POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 4.3** • Because this requirement is open-ended, there is no criteria upon which a determination of adequacy can be made. • Likewise, no basis for sanctions exist in the absence of standards. • An additional burden will be placed on state administrators by adding this requirement. **POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 4.4** • Identifying mobile handicapped children as a monitoring target will help focus administrative attention on the needs of this population. • Self-improvement may result from the simple fact of forthcoming monitoring, with the assistance of monitoring materials disseminated in advance. • If deficiencies are identified as a result of monitoring, technical assistance and self-planning activities can be designed to correct the inadequacies. **POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 4.4** • Differences in policy, standards, definitions, programs, and beliefs may make it difficult to determine administative responsibility. • Verification of mobility may be difficult to determine. • The addition of these procedures may increase time and cost factors. • Without the adoption of Option 1.5 regarding computerized transfer of records either utilizing the MSRTS or not, some of these monitoring activities would be difficult to carry out.
OPTION 4.5 CONTRACTING WITH MIGRANT EDUCATION The State Education Agency, as the "Sole State Agency" responsible for insuring delivery of special education, shall contract with the migrant education projects operating in the state and pay such funds as required for the appropriate special education of migrant handicapped students. The migrant education section will employ qualified special education teachers and meet all other state special education standards (Colorado currently utilizes this approach). The SEA will monitor such contracts.	**POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 4.5** • Migrant educators being familiar with the migrant culture and having established relationships with the community are better able to carry out child find and secure parental cooperation than those without such expertise. • Migrant education programs tend to have flexible schedules which would increase days of attendance. • Supervision by migrant administrators using state special education guidelines, is more likely to be appropriate for the migrant handicapped child's needs.

POLICY AREAS	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS
OPTION 4.6 RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (FEDERAL) The Department of Education, through the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services and the National Institute for Handicapped Research, shall undertake activities to promote, improve, support and evaluate the effectiveness of efforts to educate mobile handicapped students. Such activities may include the following: • Engaging in federal cooperative agreements to establish national policy leadership relative to the identification of and delivery of services to mobile handicapped students and to maximize the use of federal monies. Other federal agencies with whom such agreements may be explored include the Office of Migrant Education, the Department of Defense (Military Dependents), The Social Security Administration (Foster Care), and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. • Examining existing agreements for needed revisions to assess or address the needs of mobile populations. • Conducting ongoing research efforts to examine the issues, document the status and propose recommendations to meet the needs of this unique population. • Funding demonstration projects. • Funding parent and personnel training projects. • Coordinating with the National Council of the Handicapped and other relevant bodies. • Establishing a consortium to build greater awareness of the needs and possibilities of educating mobile students, to promote and support policy initiatives and program development, to engage in responsible inquiry and to assist states and the federal government in developing the complex support systems required for progress in this important area.	POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 4.5 • For some low incidence handicapped children, it would be more practical to utilize existing programs. POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 4.6 • Competing demands for limited financial resources require creative broad based solutions. • The federal role should not be limited to one of compliance determination but should actively promote, through its various component programs, the examination and resolution of problematic issues as they arise. • Through such efforts, the Department will enhance educational opportunities for handicapped mobile children by strengthening state awarenesss, policy and capabilities. POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF OPTION 4.6 • Realizing the constraints on bureaucratic action, one acknowledges the implementation of these options lies in the future. • The initial burden of implementation will fall on a few individuals with other responsibilities and priorities already existing.

72

REFERENCES

Act 754 Regulations, Education of All Exceptional Children. Louisiana Department of Education. Baton Rouge, LA., 1978.

An Analysis of Categorical Definitions, Diagnostic Methods, Diagnostic Criteria and Personnel Utilization in the Classification of Handicapped Children. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, August, 1977.

An Analysis of the Administration of the Title I Migrant Education Program By the U.S. Office of Education; Title I Migrant Education Project of the National Council of La Raza, 1977.

Aquirre, Javier. Migrant Children With Exceptional Needs. Sunnyside, Washington: Migrant Education Program, 1979.

Barresi, Josephine and Mack, Jean. Diplomas, Graduation Requirements and Grading Procedures. A Policy Research Report Prepared for the State of Arkansas. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, February, 1980.

Benson, Gerald P. and Others. Mobility in Sixth Graders As Related to Achievement, Adjustment and Socioeconomic Status. Psychology in the Schools. 16. 444-447.

Black, Frank S. and Bargar, Robert R. Relating Pupil Mobility and Reading Achievement. Reading Teacher. 28. 370-374. January, 1975.

Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports. Series 20, No. 305. 1977.

Chapman, Robert. Final Report - Student Population and State of Services for Migrant Handicapped Children in New York State. New York: Migrant Handicapped Education Assessment Project, September, 1978.

Children's Defense Fund. Children Without Homes. Washington, D.C.: 1978.

Council of State Governments. "The Interstate Placement of Children: A Preliminary Report." Lexington, Kentucky, 1978.

Doe v. Plyler, 458 F. Supp. 569.

Evaluation of the Impact of Title I, ESEA, Programs for Migrant Agricultural Workers; Exotech Systems, Inc., 1973.

FEDAC Supporting Statement for Telephone Survey to Study the Extent to Which the Individualized Education Program Mandate of P.L. 94-142 Is Being Implemented For Migrant Children. North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute. June, 1979.

Frazier, Calvin M. Correspondence from the Colorado Commissioner of Education. July 23, 1980.

Gigliotte, Richard J. Residential Stability and Academic Sense of Control. Journal of Black Studies. 6. 221-256. March, 1976.

Conzales, James and Hunter, Perry. Special Education Needs of Migrant Handicapped Children. A Report of Seminar Proceedings. Education Commission of the States. Phoenix, Arizona: March 13-14, 1980.

Goodman, Thomas L. Coping With The Transient Student. Paper Presented at the Annual Convention of the National School Boards Association, April, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 105655)

Grumet, Lou. Conversation with the New York State Director of Special Education. August 25, 1980.

HEW Audit Agency Migrant Education Program Report; Audit Agency of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1974.

Hinesley, Howard. Conversation with the Assistant Superintendent of Special Education, Pinellas County Florida and Project Representative of the Council of Administrators of Special Education. July 28. 1980.

Hinkle, Glenn E., Tipton, Robert L., and Tutchings, Terrence R. EDS. Who Cares? Who Counts? Teacher Corps. Washington, D.C., September, 1979.

Hockenberry, Cathe McCall. Policy Issues and Implications on the Education of Adjudicated Handicapped Youth. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children. September, 1979.

Hockenberry, Cathe and Higgins, Scottie. Policy Options Regarding Graduation Requirements and their Impact on Handicapped Students. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children. February, 1979.

Hunter, Bruce and Perry, John. "Secondary Schools Programs for Migrant Students." A Report of Seminar Proceedings of the ECS Interstate Migrant Education Task Force. Washington, D.C.: April 24-25, 1980.

Impact of Federal Programs to Improve the Living Conditions of Migrant and Other Seasonal Farmworkers; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1973.

Interstate Migrant Education Task Force. First Interim Report: Findings and Recommendations. Education Commission of the States. Denver, Colorado: 1977.

Interstate Migrant Education Task Force. Migrant Health. Education Commission of the States. Denver, Colorado: 1979.

Interstate Migrant Education Task Force. Second Interim Report: Findings and Recommendations. Education Commission of the States. Denver, Colorado: 1978.

Interstate Migrant Education Task Force. Third Interim Report: Findings and Recommendations. Education Commission of the States. Denver, Colorado: 1979.

Mack, Jean Harris, Barresi, Josephine and Bunte, Joanne. Special Education Class Sizes. A State of Policy Report. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children. March, 1980.

Megiveron, Gene E. Student Mobility and Curricular Concerns. NASSP Bulletin. 109-111. January, 1980.

Metzger, Richard L. and Others. The Classroom As Learning Context: Changing Rooms Affects Performance. Journal of Educational Psychology. 71, 440-442. August, 1979.

Migrant Child Welfare; InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc., 1977.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. Graduation Requirements. Reston, Virginia: 1975.

National Center for Education Statistics, DHEW Publication No. (OE) 72-20, "Pupil Mobility in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools During the 1968-69 School Year," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children, 1971. Wednesday's Children: A Report on Programs Funded Under the Migrant Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Author.

National Education Association. A Study Report: Education for All Handicapped Children: Consensus, Conflict and Challenge. Washington, D.C.: 1978.

Newkirk, Diane, Block, Dorothy and Shrybman, James. An Analysis of Categorical Definitions, Diagnostic Methods, Diagnostic Criteria and Personnel Utilization in the Classification of Handicapped Children. The Council for Exceptional Children. Reston, VA. March, 1978.

Parker, Paul C. Access and Mobility in Higher Education: The Search for a Common Currency and a Gold Standard. Liberal Education. 65, 120-134. Summer, 1979.

Promises to Keep: The Continuing Crisis in the Education of Migrant Children; National Child Labor Committee, 1977,

Pyecha, John N. A Strategy for Using the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) to Better Serve Handicapped Migrant Children. North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute. May, 1979.

Resolution Regarding Homebound/Hospital Programs. Proposal. The Council for Exceptional Children Tennessee Federation #242 Newsletter. June, 1980.

Rosewater, Ann. Minimum Competency Testing Programs and Handicapped Students: Perspectives of Policy and Practice. The Education of the Handicapped Policy Project, Institute for Educational Leadership, The George Washington University. Washington, D.C.: 1979.

Smith, Barbara J. Policies and Procedures for the Implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 Within the North Carolina Division of Youth Services. Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill: 1978.

Splete, Howard and Rasmussen, Jeanette. Aiding the Mobile Child. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling. 11, 225-228. February, 1977.

Title I Migrant Education Program. Education Briefing Paper, U.S. Office of Education, August, 1978.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series p. 20, No. 331, Geographic Mobility: March 1975 to March 1978. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Vasaly, Shirley M. "Foster Care in Five States." DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 76-30097. Washington, D.C.

Wagner, G.A., and Feletti, G.I. The Effects of Frequent Changes On Self Concept. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies. 9, 139-144. November, 1974.

Weintraub, Frederick and Higgins, Scottie. Policy Factors for Consideration in Developing Adaptable Fiscal Systems. Reston, Virginia: Policy Options Project. The Council for Exceptional Children. July, 1979.

RESOURCE PERSONS

Bove, Richard - Chief, Bureau of Migrant Education, New York.

Brannon, Vernon - Migrant Student Record Transfer System, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Brinegar, Leslie - Assistant Superintendent of Special Education, California.

Cramer, Raymond - Special Education Director, Orange Ulster BOCES, New York.

Cullar, Wendy - Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students, Florida.

Fanning, Peter - Director of Special Education, Colorado.

Frazier, Calvin M. - Commissioner of Education, Colorado.

Fuentes, Roy - Migrant Project, National Education Association.

Graham, Joyce, Mrs. - Migrant Parent, New Paltz, New York.

Grumet, Lou - State Director of Special Education, New York.

Levy, Robert - Migrant Youth Program, Onionta, New York.

Lynch-Naidich, Kathleen - Principal, Special Education Center, Williamson, New York.

Merrill, Muriel, Mrs. - Migrant Parent, Newberry, New York.

Miller, Joseph - Migrant Student Record Transfer System, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Miller, Judy - Ringling Brothers, Barnum and Bailey Combined Shows, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Morra, Linda - Office of Special Education, Washington, D.C.

Pyecha, John - Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.

Riley, Dean - Special Education Director, Wayne Finger Lakes BOCES, New York.

Rivera, Vidal - Chief, Office of Migrant Education, Washington, D.C.

Sanders, Doris - Director of Special Education, Polk County, Florida.

Sauer, Richard - Special Education Resource and Training Center, New York.

Schrag, Judy A. - Director of Special Education, Washington.

Smith, Paul - Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C.

Steidle, John - Office of Migrant Education, Washington, D.C.

Ward, Pat - Bureau of Migrant Education, New York.

Weston, Don - Director of Special Education, Texas.

MSRTS SPECIAL PROGRAM CODES
That Are Clearly Handicapped Related

039 BEHAVIOR DISABILITY - state funded program for children having a behavior problem. Services can be provided only after parental consent.

057 RESOURCE ROOM - state programs through special education. It is used to mainstream gifted, physically handicapped or retarded children.

060 REHABILITATION SERV

065 SPEC LEARNING DIS - state supported program for children with learning disabilities.

066 SPEECH CORRECTION - state funded program that provides speech therapy by a therapist.

068 SPEECH - provides speech therapy by a therapist.

070 SPECIAL ED - state supported program for mentally retarded children. Students must be evaluated by a psychologist with consent of parents.

072 SPEECH THERAPY - state funded program that provides therapy by a therapist.

073 SPEECH IMPROVEMENT

109 EMR RESOURCE - EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED RESOURCE - is on the elementary level where a child spends from 45 minutes to 2 hours per day with the EMR teacher and this time can be used to cover problems concerning social adaptation, psychomotor (fine and gross motor skills, self-help skills and academic skills).

110 EMR BLOCK - EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED BLOCK - is on the Jr and Sr high level where the student spends 45 minutes to 2 hours with the EMR teacher and this covers all academic portions of his curriculum - e.g., social studies, math, history, language arts, etc.

111 EMR SELF-CONTAINED - EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED SELF-CONTAINED - is when the child/student remains in an EMR classroom the entire school day with the EMR teacher. This can be on both elementary and secondary levels.

135 ED HANDICAPPED EH - small classroom situation which includes children 1-5 (grade level). These children have very hard times learning basic concepts and are all working below grade level.

143 SHELTERED WORKSHOP - specialized placement for handicapped students with the emphasis on developing vocational skills and becoming employable and to attain employment.

200 TR MENT HANDICAPPED - TRAINABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED - small classroom instruction which includes children in grades K-12. The children learn basic self-help care and very basic academic concepts.

219 LRN RESOURCE CENTER - children with Learning Disabilities to qualify for this program must have 50 percent discrepancy between grade level and Diagnostic Test Scores.

222 DEAF EDUCATION - is for students with severe hearing problems who need special instruction and special therapist in order to understand and/or grasp what is being presented.

239 LRN DISABTY - TUT - MATH

240 LRN DISABTY - TUT - RDG

241 LRN DISABTY - TUT - SPEL - LEARNING DISABILITY - TUTORIAL - SPELLING

253 MULTI-HANDICAPPED CLASS

254 NEUROLOG HANDICAPPED

255 SEVERE SPEECH

256 SIGHT IMPROVE PROG

259 SPECIAL OLYMPICS - a program for children who are either physically or mentally handicapped consisting of games and sports.

268 LEARN DISAB 94-142 - an individualized instruction program for the learning disabled.

276 PHYSICAL THERAPY - services prescribed and provided by a physical therapist consisting of range of motion exercises and therapy for muscle re-education.

277 OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY - services prescribed and provided by an occupation therapist for muscle strengthening.

281 PLN A LRN DISABL 1-2 - for students who are 1 to 2 years behind grade level.

290 HOME/HOSPITAL INSTR - students who are unable to attend school on a regular basis due to a physical and/or severe emotional disability are tutored at home.

324 LRNG DISABILITY GROUP - a special class for children who have learning disabilities in which they receive one-to-one help in areas where they have problems.

325 COMMUNICATIVE DSR CL - COMMUNICATIVE DISORDER CLASS - a special class for children who have communicative disorders in which they receive one-to-one help in areas where they have problems.

368 SEV/PRO FDLY HAND CAPD - SEVERE/PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED - in this program the child remains in a classroom for the entire school day with a teacher of the severe/profoundly handicapped. This can be both Elementary and Secondary Levels.